REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. in the Office Action of July 21, 2010, claims 1-8 and 11-25 were rejected. Claims 9-10 were merely objected to, but would be allowed if re-written in independent form.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 24 and 25 are amended.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 9 and 10 were objected to, but would be allowed if re-written in independent form.

With this Amendment, claim 9 is re-written in independent form and claim 10 has been made dependant on claim 9. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims and 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-2, 21-22 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Glazer* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,588,497).

Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Glazer*.

Claims 3-6, 15-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(*) as being unpatentable over *Glazer* in view of *Ziada* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,798,465) ("*Ziada*").

Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Glazer* in view of *Ziada* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,798,465) ("*Ziada*") and in further view of *Scher* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,282,837) ("*Scher*").

Claims 13-14, 18, 20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Glazer* in view of *Scher*.

Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1, 24 and 25 recite a plurality of ejecting sections arranged to eject a pulsating gas flow such that sound waves generated by the vibration of an upper portion of a vibrator and sound waves generated by a lower portion of a vibrator have the same wave form but reversed phases such that the sound waves weaken each other upon ejection from the ejector.

Glazer fails to disclose or even fairly suggest a plurality of ejecting sections arranged to eject a pulsating gas flow such that sound waves generated by the vibration of an upper portion of a vibrator and sound waves generated by a lower portion of a vibrator have the same wave form but reversed phases such that the sound waves weaken each other upon ejection from the ejector. Instead, *Glazer* discloses two diaphragms positioned parallel to one another on an upper surface and a lower surface of a first chamber that are oscillated independently, but out of phase, in a time harmonic motion such that air is ejected from the first chamber and a second chamber. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,588,497, Col. 11, l. 25-35. This cannot be fairly viewed as disclosing pulsating gas flow such that sound waves generated by the vibration of an upper portion of a vibrator and sound waves generated by a lower portion of a vibrator have the same wave form but reversed phases such that the sound waves weaken each other upon ejection from the ejector, because *Glazer* discloses two actuators in a single chamber that merely oscillates out of phase such that air is ejected from two chambers without disclosing anything pertaining to reversing the phases of the sound waves.

Ziana, similarly, fails to disclose a plurality of ejecting sections arranged to eject a pulsating gas flow such that sound waves generated by the vibration of an upper portion of a vibrator and sound waves generated by a lower portion of a vibrator have the same wave form but reversed phases such that the sound waves weaken each other upon ejection from the ejector.

Instead, *Ziana* discloses dampening the flow from a slot by producing an external compensatory oscillation using an external generator to counteract the oscillation generated by the flow from the slot. See, U.S. Pat. No. 5,798,465, Col. 6, l. 39- 65. This cannot be fairly viewed as disclosing a plurality of ejecting sections adapted for ejecting gas in the form of a pulsating flow such that vibration of the vibrator allows sound waves respectively generated upon ejection of the gas to weaken each other because *Ziana* merely discloses producing a compensatory oscillation from an external generator to dampen an oscillation caused by a flow opposed to adapting a plurality of ejecting sections to weaken the vibrations generated by a flow coming from the ejectors.

Scher similarly fails to disclose anything pertaining to a plurality of ejecting sections adapted for ejecting gas in a form of a pulsating flow such that vibration of the vibrator allows sound waves respectively generated upon ejection of the gas to weaken each other.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by providing a plurality of ejecting sections arranged to eject a pulsating gas flow such that sound waves generated by the vibration of an upper portion of a vibrator and sound waves generated by a lower portion of a vibrator have the same wave form but reversed phases such that the sound waves weaken each other upon ejection from the ejector, heat is effectively dissipated from a heat sink without the generation of noise.

Therefore, because *Glazer, Ziada* and *Scher* fail to disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claims 1, 24 and 25, the rejection of claims 1, 24 and 25 cannot stand. Because claims 2-8 and 12-23 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 24 and 25, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 20, 2010 By: /David R. Metzger/

David R Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SNR Denton US LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000